

Document 84, Stephen D. Kruse, Jackson, WY
Page 2 of 2

- Often the best solution is a combination of solutions. Most of the time just one solution does not take care of everything. Some items go to a Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), some to Hanford, most are processed here.
- Where is the best place to process HLW?
- If transportation is recommended, what is the safest mode of transport?
- If transportation is by rail, how many cars **maximum** should be concentrated on one train?
- 84-3 [Trucking may be best to WIPP, since each load may be transported when ready, rather than storing processed materials waiting on a trainload.]
VIII.A(5) [What happens if there is an accident? What kind of contamination is possible? probable?]
- 84-4 [What are the relative health risks to our workers, the general public, the environment? We VIII.A(6) need to develop an objective rating scale for each of the above.]
- 84-5 [A well-written *Cost Analysis of Alternatives* has been published, and while cost is not the most significant factor, a solution so expensive that it is not funded is not a solution. Apparently the No Action option is the only option feasible at current funding levels. Reflect that the future cost of taking no action is often incalculable, if the environment is irreparably damaged, irreplaceable.]
X(6)
- Here again the questions of "What if ..." and "How do you ...? and "Why do you ..." come to mind.
- 84-6 [Then again if the solutions are clear. Develop a plan, establish procedures, fund, and proceed.]
IX.D(9)
- 84-7 [Whatever we can do now, do now! Implement other plans as they are formulated and approved.]
VI(1) [Unless HLW will take care of itself over time without unnecessary risk, No Action will not be one of our chosen options.]
- 84-8 [Under "What if's..." we need to be mindful of weather, potential seismic influences, i.e. things not within our control; think, plan, prepare.]
II.B(1)

For me, I still have much to learn. I wish you well.

Document 85, Ellen Glaccum, Ketchum, ID
Page 1 of 2

EIS PROJECT *[Circular stamp]*
HLW & FD Control # **DC87** **RECEIVED**
MAY 15 2000 Box 1173, Ketchum, ID 83340
April 18, 2000

Thomas Wichtmann
DOE
SOS Energy DR - MS 1103
IF, ID 83401-1563

Please include these comments in the official hearing record for the DEIS - Idaho High-level Waste + facilities disposition.

I am greatly concerned about this enormous problem and I am pleased that the department is inviting public comments and suggestions. From my reading of the summary document I have the following observations, comments and suggestions which I feel need to be considered in the final EIS document:

(1) [The INEL should be cleaned up to the standards described in the "Clean Closure Alternative." I don't very much if the DOE will be able to walk away by the latter years of this century if ever. IV.A(1) Plutonium, as we all know, has a half life which is twice as long as scientists estimate human occupation of North America, so I suggest that DOE or its successors should acknowledge today that 85-2 its job most likely will never end — somebody is going to have IX.D(2) to protect generations in the distant future from plutonium contamination.]

(2) [Present and future groundwater contamination is a serious problem, considering that 85-3 the health of a major portion of the population of the state is dependent on the plutonium. Kim [Albuquerque] you say that iodine-131 could exceed the standard by 11 times and that plutonium-239 could exceed the standard by 19 times, that it is in the ground water and will exceed it standards. You also predict that materials left in place after closure will migrate to the aquifer and "public exposure could occur if people use the aquifer for drinking water and other domestic purposes." Are you serious? What does it mean for the public use of an aquifer for? The DOE must come to terms with the fact that they have seriously contaminated the aquifer already. In my opinion the #1 goal 85-4 of cleanup at INEL should be focused on "cleaning up the water contamination III.A(4) of previous additional contamination. This is the most important problem and (1) can't wait, how do you clean up a contaminated aquifer? This is even more pressing now that scientists at Los Alamos discovered that the tanks漏漏 more easily and faster now, water then had never been below.]

(3) I understand from reading this document that there seems to be no way that INEL high level waste will be leaving the state any time soon. At best, you are saying that it might be "ready" for shipment out by 2035. So much for the stupid agreement which, as we all know, only gave the okay to continue to dump its SNF on the dump truckheads. You also admit that it would be difficult to ship using the tank farm by 2031. Once you have admitted that the agreement isn't worth the paper it was signed on, why not fully plan the HLW cleanup correctly and (1) stop having the "out way the dog" [for instance, why do you hesitate to go through this EIS process to choose an alternative to treat the waste now - before DOE identifies its criteria in the mythical long-term repository? You admit that the lack of criteria 85-6 introduces some uncertainty that could affect design + operations of the treatment III.F.2 option.] OK so doesn't it make sense to decide the criteria first and then (2) come up with alternatives which would treat the waste to meet the criteria not the other way around.]

(4) [I see that DOE is up to its old trick of word fabrication and smoke 85-7 mirrors. Here see, how do we make INEL more acceptable to the public? — why add the word "environmental" & they'll all think its IX.D(5) safe. And now let's see, for how long of time HLW + does it (1) know what to do with it, but if we call it "waste incinerator" 85-9 to "processing" then we keep it in transuranic and then maybe IX.D(6) we can ship it into New Mexico, they're almost as dumb as]

85-10 the people in Idaho - long as I stop this sort of semantic
 V(9) bullshit and start honestly dealing with the problem. [redacted]

⑤ It's time to come clean to the people of Idaho that
 there is no proposal to accept mixed HLLW at Yucca and
 "It is unclear whether a geologic repository will ever
 be available to accept mixed HLLW." Continuing to
 play a political game of lies will only ruin true clean now
 IX.D trust the DOE's credibility in the long run. True clean now
 (2) and focus your energy on dismantling the myth that the mixed HLLW will
 leave Idaho. [redacted]

85-12 III.D.3(i)

⑥ It seems ridiculous to me to be considering alternatives
 which will create more waste - especially more liquid waste.
 85-13 You have big problems with the incinerator and there is no guarantee
 III.C that it will ever start again. And building a new
 (5) incinerator is not a good idea. Increased air pollution is
 85-14 a very unsafe (and unpopular) idea. You need to come to
 VIII.B(2) grips with the fact that the general population doesn't
 appear of new radio active releases into the air.

⑦ I see you have some alternatives which would take the
 85-15 existing dry tailing, re-wet it and then do more
 III.D.3(i) leaching, and then dry it again. Are you nuts?

⑧ I don't understand why you would store the glass A type
 85-16 INGC in one state and remove it to another.
 III.F.4 Since the INGC is in an earthquake & volcanic area
 (1) on top of a huge aquifer all waste should be
 removed to more geologically stable areas for storage.

85-17 VIII.E (1) 85-18 III.F.2(2)

I urge you to withdraw this document until the long term
 storage criteria have been established and then try to deal with the
 again to find the most safe way to deal with the
 huge amount of HLLW at Yucca. [redacted] also am interested
 in the disposition of the SALT & the dirt that still
 arriving. Why wasn't it addressed in this DEIS?

85-19 XI(H)

Ellen Glaccum
 Box 1173
 Ketchum, ID 83340